7/3/69

Dear Gary,

Your letter of the 26th, with enclosures (many thanks, esp for the defense) arrived today. Kid of long time.

Because I will be taking Lil into town and can then mail, this will be brief.

To any reasonable person, there can be nothing left of that slander and the question why it was engaged and persisted in now looms. I have only one comment, other than appreciation: If I didn't send you a copy of my letter to Fred telling him of the color change in Za, I can. He then had never seen Z.

Olson and the boxes: refer him to WW, under Day in the index. I spotted this that far back and to the degree I then could, went into it. Day was asked to account for the disappearance of a stack of books showing in early pictures and couldn't explain how they were removed by the time he got there. I believe among the sources then available that I checked was Willis 12.

Olson and 226-8: I may well have been wrong about tampering with the film, but the distance the camera moved without blurring, which, as I now recall, was part of my point, has yet to be explained. I hope he recalls the date of this work-May or June of 1966, when no other book than Fox's was out and I was so all alone. If he goes into Alvarez, he should compare his and CBS' claim agains WW, I believe about page 39, where I report having discovered it. I have every reason to suspect this, reported by one of his students (Paul? innocently), is what first interested him.

If Renner can get that tape he has a major thing and I'd very much want a copy for comparisons. I'll be writing him. Had letter from him today. I'll be writing Paul, too.

Crafard: do you have CD1472? He was originally hired by Robert Craven and had been with Ruby very short time for trust Ruby imparted. Recall also my memos on address book and missing O page. He had it, too.

Do you have a good, all-speed tape recorder? If not, you must have one available. Perhaps one of your new crew could undertake word for word comparison if George gets radio tape. The should like you should be encouraged.

Ferrie: check this out carefully for a former NO cameraman I'm reliably told weekended at a camp, possibly Ferrie's or Ferrie-connected, married a Minn. girl, as you should recall. If you cannot recall, dig out my memos, letters. You tried to find his studio, remember (was it called 120?)

If you make further reference to Lillian, you can add that after her name was mentioned in public, out of context but in an effort to record credit, as with Fred, I dragged it into one of the books, PM or COUP. This was long ago, from a year to almost three. How time flies! If Lifton makes any factual response, I'd be interested. I wonder how much can be attributed to his erroneous concept of self and what he calls "logic"? He is bright, but not nearly as bright as he thinks. He understand less yet considers he does understand whereas others, lesser endowed, do not or comprehend less. I think it has progressed to the point where he ignores fact inconsistent with what he wants to believe and winds up regarding anything else as unfactual. And above all, I believe he years for the recognition his own work has not earned - therefore gets even wilder. I agree with your analysis of the impact of your letters on him, from the sample you sent.

Take his advice other than he intended. Cool it, but with him, and see the result, if any.

Your suggestion about his deviousndss may be sound. But I sent copies to you and Paul only. (Nichols). My reference to the absence of Z splices refers, as I recall, to what has been substituted for the official exhibit, the FBI copy of the original SS copy. If I can sue, this is one of the thinks I'll want, the real exhibit, which is required to be in the Archives and isn't-or wasn't on my last request.

I have asked Bernabei and he hasn't responded, re Dave. It is possible I did send him a copy. And he has read my books. Sylvia says she has been almost out of contact with Dave. I'm inclined to take her word.

My request for a listnhad to do with my lack of trust of my own memory now. Perhaps I exaggerate this because it has been so dependable. I just do not want to fail to return anything. I appreciate what I get but do not want the dispenser of kindness to suffer.

Glad you found my letter to Paul interesting. I hope it was also the correct approach. I have, as you now know, since be straightforward about wanting not even indirect contact with Dave.

Not the ONI file, but the other things you get from Dave, from what he has no interest in keeping to himself only of the Archives material only, please get two copies and I'll pay you for the seconf. This makes it possible to get what otherwise cannot be afford. It means five pages for the cost of one. If you want any of the ONI stuff, of which I have a printout, I'll lend it to you. It is all pretty much duplicated elsewhere. I have many Gemberling and quite a few Clements interests (going back to WW, ig you recall), so use you own judgement. Almost anything on G, and you know my writing interests and plans. There is the further advantage of getting around the Archives barricades against me, one of the reasons I spend so little time there. Four cents a page is approximately Paul's very low price and it would be at least one step clearer.

I wonder if Dave's concern is not less over being exposed and more over being exposed more or less publicly? At least subconsciously, unless he has an illness I cannot fathom, I'd think he has to be aware of what he's been up to and how dishonest and wrong it it. If he hasn't, he is really sick. Or really worse.

By the way, the Jernigan stuff originates with Penn, not Mark.

Thanks for the Penabaz book. George writes of more.

Relet to Paul:I think Forman is a waste of time. He has added one think to what we knew and only that: the use of the skeleton, and he didn't use it well at all. Please be certain to limit access to NO files.

You earlier sent me you 6/18 to Dave with the request I copy and return. I did, so if you need the carbon back, let me know. The copy is far from clear because it is on both sides of tissue, but it will do if I ever need it.

If Olson wants my opinion of who was really and immediately responsible for the needless rush, I'll be glad to tell him. I agree it wasn't Warren and never believe it was, as the Introduction to WW shows, and that was before anyone wrote anything. His last sentence on this is at best inadequate and possible wrong. He is right on the film movement out of plane. It is not uncommon, esp. in home-movie cameras. His illustration is excellent. But he, while right about the lateral motion, ignores the point I was making, horizontal motion, <u>vertical</u>.

His formulation,"...first shot hit the President and not the street" is imprecise, for it is my recollection that some said or their testimony means one bullet did both. He should cover himself on this in his final formulation. He need not depend on Thompson for ugliest position. I have it from the FBI, at Main and Houston. If he want to check further, one of the possibilities is the natural distortion in Hughes' lens, esp at that distance. He reply should begin with WW on this and then go to my citations. More is possible, but I do not now recall what, if anything, I considered unessential.

Hal says he has some Dallas chores for you. I suggested he restrict to two: wha t may be really valuable and what there is prosepct of accomplishing. He is inclined toward imaginativeness and romanticizing.

Reading the excerpts from my letter impresses upon me how desireable it would be to read and correct before I mail, but the other things I do with the time press upon me more. Apologies.

Sincerely,